



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

218

CRM-M No.69344 of 2025

Date of decision : 12.12.2025

Date of uploading : 12.12.2025

Jasbir Singh @ Jasvseer Singh @ BabluPetitioner

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Bansi Lal Sachdeva, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Gaurav Gurcharan S. Rai, Senior DAG, Punjab

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.40 dated 11.4.2025 under Sections 105, 304, 115(2), 3(5), 238 and 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Giddarbaha, District Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

2. The gravamen of allegations against the petitioner is that the petitioner in connivance with other co-accused gave beatings to deceased after giving him over dose of drugs and also snatched his mobile phone. The deceased could not survive the over dose of the drugs.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner is in custody since 12.04.2025. Learned counsel has iterated that the



petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further argued that prime private prosecution witnesses, namely, PW1-Ved Parkash, PW2-Mahinder & PW3-Dharampal have been examined and they have turned hostile, thus, trial is not likely to be culminated into conviction. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature, and thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record the custody certificate dated 10.12.2025, in the Court today, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 12.04.2025, whereinafter, the investigation was carried out and the challan has been presented on 10.6.2025. Total 14 prosecution witnesses have been cited, out of which, only 5 have been examined till date. Culmination of trial, but of course, will take its own time. The rival contentions raised at Bar; including weightage required to be attached to the testimony of hostile witnesses; shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, *lest* it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.2 As per custody certificate dated 10.12.2025 filed by learned



State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 7 months and 25 days. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in one more FIR registered under the NDPS Act. Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586***; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of ***Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477*** & judgments of this Court in ***CRM-M No.38822-2022*** titled as ***Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana***, decided on 29.11.2021, and ***Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191***.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-



- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

12.12.2025
Ashwanii

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No